

### **REMARKS**

By this Reply, claims 1 and 12 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-12 are pending in the application, of which claims 1 and 12 are independent.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification. Support for the amendments may be found at least in Figures 12, 15, and 17, and at page 15, lines 4-5, and paragraphs [0098] and [0099] of the specification.

In view of the above amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending rejections for at least the reasons discussed below.

#### ***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

To establish an obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), four factual inquiries must be examined. The four factual inquiries include (a) determining the scope and contents of the prior art; (b) ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims in issue; (c) resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art; and (d) evaluating evidence of secondary consideration. *Graham v. John Deere*, 383 U.S. 1, 17-18 (1966). In view of these four factors, the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be made explicit, and should "identify a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the [prior art] elements" in the manner claimed. *KSR Int'l. Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. \_\_\_, slip op. at 14-15 (2007). Thus, even if the prior art may be combined, the references when combined must disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations. See *in re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Claims 1-3 and 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly

unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,262,699, issued to Suzuki, *et al.* ("Suzuki") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,525,486, issued to Awamoto, *et al.* ("Awamoto"), further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,496,164, issued to Kuwahara, *et al.* ("Kuwahara").

Suzuki, Awamoto, and Kuwahara, even if combined, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 1 as amended. Claim 1 as amended recites, *inter alia*:

wherein ... in a mixed address-display period of one subfield, a first XY electrode pair group is addressed and sustain-discharged by a first driving circuit before a second XY electrode pair group is addressed by a second driving circuit, and both the first XY electrode pair group and the second XY electrode pair group are sustain-discharged after the second XY electrode pair group is addressed.

Even if combined, Suzuki, Awamoto, and Kuwahara fail to disclose or suggest at least these features. As the examiner concedes on page 3 of the Office Action, Suzuki and Awamoto fail to disclose or suggest "a mixed address-display period." So the examiner turns to Kuwahara for this feature. Specifically, the examiner looks to Kuwahara's Figs. 6 and 7 to disclose that "a first XY electrode pair group is addressed and sustain-discharged by a first driving circuit before a second XY electrode pair group is addressed by a second driving circuit." But Applicants disagree that this occurs in "a mixed address-display period of one subfield" as claimed in claim 1.

As shown in Kuwahara's Fig. 7, a frame is split into an odd field and an even field, which are separate from each other. In the odd field, each sub-field includes its own separate address period and its own separate sustain period. And in the even field, the same arrangement exists: namely, each sub-field includes its own separate address period and its own separate sustain period. Thus, Kuwahara's Fig. 7 appears to disclose nothing more than a conventional interlaced driving scheme where the odd lines are reset, addressed, and sustain-discharged during a first half of a frame, and the even lines are reset, addressed, and sustain-discharged during a second half of the frame. This is not "a mixed address-display period of one subfield."

Specifically, even in only one subfield of Kuwahara's Fig. 7, Kuwahara fails to disclose "a first XY electrode pair group is addressed and sustain-discharged by a first driving circuit before a second XY electrode pair group is addressed by a second driving circuit, and both the first XY electrode pair group and the second XY electrode pair group are sustain-discharged after the second XY electrode pair group is addressed."

Moreover, Applicants traverse that Suzuki, Awamoto, and Kuwahara can be combined as suggested by the examiner. On one hand, the examiner suggests combining Suzuki and Awamoto to achieve "driving circuits commonly connected to a reset circuit" so that "it would ensure that the reset is applied to all of the electrodes at the same time." Office Action, page 3. However, as noted above, Kuwahara has distinct reset periods and does not apply a reset to all of the electrodes at the same time. Thus, not only do these three references, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose every feature of claim 1, but these references are incompatible and cannot be combined as suggested by the examiner.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is allowable over Suzuki in view of Awamoto, further in view of Kuwahara.

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Lee in view of Suzuki, in view of Awamoto, in further view of Kuwahara.

Claim 12 has been amended consistently with claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons asserted above with respect to claim 1, Suzuki in view of Awamoto, further in view of Kuwahara fail to disclose or suggest "a mixed address-display period of one subfield." Further, Lee discloses an address-display separation display method and an address-while-display driving method (see Lee, Fig. 3; Fig. 4), but also fails to disclose "a mixed address-display period of one subfield." Thus, Lee fails to disclose or suggest the shortcomings of Suzuki in view of Awamoto, further in view of Kuwahara.

For at least these reasons, claim 12 is allowable over Lee in view of Suzuki, in view of Awamoto, further in view of Kuwahara.

Claims 4-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Awamoto, further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0057858, applied for by Lee, *et al.* ("Lee"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable over Suzuki in view of Awamoto alone. Lee fails to cure the deficiencies of Suzuki in view of Awamoto noted above with regard to claim 1. Hence, claims 4-7 are allowable at least because they depend from an allowable claim 1.

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Awamoto, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,091,380 issued to Hashimoto, *et al.* ("Hashimoto"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable over Suzuki in view of Awamoto alone. Hashimoto fails to cure the deficiencies of Suzuki in view of Awamoto noted above with regard to claim 1. Hence, claim 11 is allowable at least because it depends from an allowable claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1 and 12. Claims 2-11 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least for this reason. Since the other prior art of record, whether taken alone or in any combination, does not disclose or suggest all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 12, and all the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable.

***All Pending Claims are Allowable over the Art of Record***

Since none of the other prior art of record discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 12, and all the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants have made a complete response to the Office Action and submit that the stated grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, all pending claims are allowable and the application is in condition for allowance.

If it would expedite prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/hae-chan park/

Hae-Chan Park  
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: July 10, 2008

**CUSTOMER NUMBER: 58027**

H.C. Park & Associates, PLC  
8500 Leesburg Pike  
Suite 7500  
Vienna, VA 22182  
Tel: 703-288-5105  
Fax: 703-288-5139  
HCP/WMH/mro